xii. But that which is of more moment yet, we have the authority of Ecphantus, a famous Pythagorean for this, that Pythagoras's Monads, so much talked of[2] were nothing else but corporeal Atoms. Thus we find it in Stobseus,[a] *raq Hv-*

Bayopucag MovaSac ovroc TTJOWTOC aTrc^rjvaro *(TWfJLaTiKa^*

Ecphantus (who himself [b] asserted the doctrine of A toms)first declared, that the Pythagoric Monads were corporeal, — i. e. Atoms. And this is further confirmed from what Aristotle[0] himself writes of these Pythagoreans and their Monads, *-rag* Mo-vaSac vTroAa/xjSavoixnv e)(£iv ju£-y[f]0oc* they suppose their Monads to have magnitude. — And from that he elsewhere[6] makes Monads and Atoms to signify

the sariie thing, ovSev Sia^epei MovaSac Xl-yav *rj* <rw/xcma *fffjLiKpd*[9] It is all one to say.monades or small cor-p'uscula. — And Gassendus[e] hath observed out of the Greek epigrammatist/ that Epicurus's Atoms were sometimes called Monads too ;—

sarw

Ttov TO Jtevov ^TEtv *ttcti rtvef cu.*
MovaSef.

xni. But to pass from % Pythagoras himself; that Empedocles, who was a Pythagorean also, did physiologize atomically, is a thing that could hardly be doubted of, though there were no more proof for it than that one passage of his in his philosophic poems :[s]

*AXXi *(Awav fj.i%i$ re* S

* Eclog. Phys. lib. i. cap. xiii. p. 27. edit. Plantin. 1575. fol.

[b] Stob. ubi supra, lib. i. c. xxv. p. 48.

[c] Metaphys. lib. xi. c, \i. torn. iv. oper. p. 424.

[4] De Anima, lib. ii. c. vi. p. 13. torn. ii. oper.

[e] Physices sect. i. lib. iii. c. iv. p. 256. torn* i. oper. etin Notis ad lib. ix. Diog. Laertii, p. 70. torn. v. oper.

[f] Antholog. Graecor. Epigram, lib. i. xv. p. 32. edit Prancof. 1600. fol. % ^ Vide Plut. de Placitis Philos. lib. i- c.xxx. p. 885. torn. ii. oper.